

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Formalities

The claims and specification have been revised to place the application in proper U.S. format and to correct the typographic error noted in item 2 on page 2 of the Official Action. Because the changes are all formal in nature, it is respectfully submitted that the changes do not involve new matter.

2. Rejection of Claims 1-5 Under 35 USC §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,746 (Stanley)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Stanley patent fails to disclose or suggest a storage communication network card in which a first end is arranged to be inserted into a card insert slot of a first computing device, and the second end is arranged to be connected to a second computing device, the card being responsive to commands supplied through *either* interface, so that the card can either be connected in conventional fashion by inserting it into the PC card slot, or the card can be connected through a cabled or bluetooth interface without the need for the host to include a PC card slot or corresponding adapter.

The claimed invention is essentially a card-type peripheral device that, like other PC card-type peripheral devices is arranged to be inserted into a notebook computer PC card slot and to respond to action signals supplied through the PC card slot. Unlike other PC card-type peripheral devices, however, the second end of the device is also capable of connected to a computing device, and the peripheral device is capable of responding to action signals from *either* end. Thus, the claimed peripheral device is capable of being connected at opposite ends to different host computing devices with different types of interfaces.

While it is known to add a USB or 1394 connector to a PC card, the added connector is generally used to facilitate communications between a single host, connected through the insert slot, and additional peripheral devices. **The card of the claimed invention is essentially a single peripheral that supports *two* hosts, and can be controlled by *either*.** In contrast, the Stanley patent discloses “*a next-generation industry specification that defines a mechanism for easily adding and upgrading PC peripheral devices without opening the computer chassis,*” i.e., **a docking station for connecting multiple peripherals to a single host.** Whereas the claimed invention is capable of accepting commands through interfaces at different ends to control a circuit board or other electronic components *within* the card, the docking station of Stanley essentially merely relays (in a sophisticated fashion that requires its own microcontroller) commands from the host to the multiple peripherals connected thereto.

The manner in which the docking station of Stanley is connected to a first computing device is described in col. 9, lines 35 *et seq.* of the Stanley patent. In particular, the first computing device is connected through a device bay connector 625 to a device bay controller 616. The is no provision for connection of a second computing device to the device bay controller. While the docking station includes different types of interfaces that may be used to connect the first computing device, there is no provision for connection of a second computing device and acceptance of command from either of two devices.

Further, the docking station of Stanley is clearly not in the form of a network card that can be inserted into the PC card insert slot of a computing device, as claimed. The device of Stanley is a docking station into which a computing device may be plugged, and not a peripheral that can be plugged into a computing device, and connected at a second end to *another* computing device as claimed. The lack of any sort of resemblance to a PC network card of the type claimed is immediately apparent from Fig. 5 of the Stanley patent.

Because the Stanley patent fails to disclose or suggest a peripheral in the form of a network card that can be inserted in the card insert slot of a first computing device and also

S.N. 09/929,353

connected to a second computing device through a second interface at an opposite end of the card, so that components in the peripheral can be controlled by either of the two computing devices, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 USC §102(e) in view of the Stanley patent is respectfully requested.

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'By Urcia', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

Date: June 15, 2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB\S\Producer\New\Pending L...PLALIG 920353\w01.wpd